

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 CITY OF LOS ANGELES,

12 Plaintiff,

13
14 v.

15 WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General of
16 the United States, *et al.*,

17 Defendants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 2:18-cv-07347-JLS-JC

FINAL JUDGMENT

FINAL JUDGMENT

I. BACKGROUND

On February 15, 2019, this Court granted partial summary judgment to Plaintiff City of Los Angeles (the “City”) as to Count One in its First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (the “Complaint”), holding that the Defendants’ imposition of the immigration-related Conditions¹ on the Fiscal Year (“FY”) 2018 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistant Grant (“Byrne JAG”) program were “ultra vires as a matter of law and a violation of separation of powers.” ECF No. 62 at 5-8. Because summary judgment was granted as to Count One (Plaintiff’s ultra vires claim), this Court did not reach the City’s alternative grounds for partial summary judgment on the FY 2018 Byrne JAG conditions (Counts Two, Three, and Four), and these were rendered moot. *Id.* at 8.² Determining that the requisites for entry of a permanent injunction were met, this Court issued a permanent injunction that enjoined Defendants “from imposing the Conditions on FY 2018 Byrne JAG awards and [Gang Suppression Planning Grants Program (“Gang Suppression Grant Program”)].” *Id.* at 9-10.

On July 1, 2019, this Court vacated part of its February 15, 2019 order and injunction (ECF No. 62), “solely to the extent” that it related to the FY 2018 Gang Suppression Grant Program, without affecting any part of “the Court’s injunction that concerns the Byrne JAG Program.” ECF No. 79.

¹ These are the Notice Condition, the Access Condition, the 1373 and 1644 Condition, the Harboring Condition, the Questionnaire Condition, and the 1366 Condition, as set forth at ECF No. 62 at 5-8.

² Counts Two, Three, and Four alleged, respectively, that imposition of the challenged Conditions on the FY 2018 Byrne JAG program violated the Spending Clause of the U.S. Constitution, violated the anti-commandeering principles of the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and constituted arbitrary and capricious agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). *See* ECF No. 40 at 38-41.

1 previously entered by the Court (ECF Nos. 62 and 105) are incorporated into this final
2 judgment.

3 **III. PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

4 The City preserves its rights to seek reasonable costs, including attorney's fees, for
5 this matter and any future related proceeding. Defendants preserve their rights to object
6 to or to oppose any attempt by the City to recover costs or attorney's fees.

7
8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: July 09, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Josephine L. Staton", written over a horizontal line.

HON. JOSEPHINE L. STATON
United States District Judge